UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/632,892 | 07/31/2003 | C. Bret Elzinga | 6922.34 | 3057 |
| Kirton & McCo | 7590 03/16/201 onkie | EXAMINER | | |
| Attn: David B. | Tingey | UTAMA, ROBERT J | | |
| 1800 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East South Temple | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Salt Lake City, | UT 84145-0120 | 3715 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/16/2011 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/632,892 | ELZINGA ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| ROBERT J. UTAMA | 3715 | | |

| | ROBERT J. UTAMA | 3715 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (1) an amendment, affidavited (2) an amendment (2) an amend | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a ster than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE c). | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII | on. LED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | s of the date of appeal. Since a |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or | nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec | E below); | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | TOL 2041 |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | · | • | _ |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | i be entered and an e. | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>02/28/20</u> | <u>)11</u> | |
| /XUAN M. THAI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715 | | | |
| • | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As dicussed in the interview summary, 02/04/2011, the rejections on claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 under 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph are hereby withdrawn.

With respect to applicant's argument on the special definition of the phrase "educational content" and "educational activity", the applicant argued the phrase "educational content" should be interpreted as something that the students learn and the phrase "educational activity" as something that the student perform". However, the applicant has not shown how this special definition would overcome the Krebs, Parry, Bull and Turner combination. Arguably, the Krebs reference both contain a "educational content" and "educational activity". Educational data that contains history, facts and scenario inherently have an educational content. Educational data that contains strategy, rule and checklist are inherently educational activities (see col. 5:25-30). Furthermore, both the Krebs and Frankenberry reference supports the idea that the term "educational content" and "educational activities" are separate entity; as it would be impossible to perform educational activities devoid of educational contents and vice versa.

With respect to applicant's argument that the combination of Krebs, Parry, Bull and Turner fails to provide a teaching of "selectively prioritizing the individually matched educational content and corresponding activities for presentation to the particular learner based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system". The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed during the office action (10/27/2010); the applicant has not shown any special definition to the phrase "performance data". The Bull reference shows a computer system that can prioritize and select classes for an individual based on completed or attended classes. The examiner takes the position that "performance data" can be defined as data that shows past accomplishment or deed or feat. As such, the completed or attended classes data would meet this definition.